

Performance of Self-Help Groups in Government and NGO Sectors: A Comparative Analysis ¹

Dr. Ravindra K.,

Lecturer, Gulf College,
Sultanate of Oman

Email: ravikonaje@rediffmail.com

Abstract

Self Help Groups (SHGs) as an institution for the human interaction gained popularity in the rural set up especially among the rural woman. This has become an important strategy for government and Non-government organizations (NGOs) to achieve people participation in the rural development. They encourage people to participate in microfinance and entrepreneurial activities. The most significant question is how these strategies perform both in government and Non-government sectors? Comparative studies on SHGs are less researched. It is interesting to compare the growth, organizational and operational methods and performances of SHGs both in government sector and NGO sector. Studies focus on either impact assessment or explaining the internal factors which account for the success or failure of the SHGs. They narrowly focus on their programmatic success. They focus on the issues like SHGs as a credit agency, as an entrepreneurship development agency, as a group entrepreneurship encouraging scheme, as a voluntary association, as a mechanism of implementing government rural development scheme and SHGs as a women empowerment scheme etc. However, there are strong external factors, which in turn decide the activities - funding and monitoring of the Self Help Groups. These external factors vary in their nature and influence depending upon whether they are in the public sector i.e., the government sector or the Voluntary sector namely NGOs. In the lattercase, there is another level of influence, albeit indirect, i.e., the policies and goals of the organizations which fund these NGOs. This will be true of the government-aided SHGs too if the Governments concerned have taken external aid for promoting SHGs. Here the author seeks to address this problem by comparing across SHGs promoted by NGOs and Other agencies by analysing organizational, operational and empowerment aspects of SHGs.

Keywords: Non-Government Organizations, Self Help Groups, microfinance, entrepreneurship, Government, comparative analysis, empowerment.

¹ This paper is extracted from the doctoral thesis of the author. The author acknowledges the guidance and support of Prof. Shripathi P. Kalluraya, PhD Supervisor.

Introduction

Raising the standard of living of disadvantaged and deprived people in the world is a great task of both government and non-government organizations (NGOs). These organizations at local, national and international levels are employing considerable amount of financial and human resources to respond to the problems of poverty, illiteracy, ill health and unemployment, which keep people backward. Irrespective of these efforts there exists visible gap between expectations and achievements. Backwardness, disparities still exist and socio-economic backwardness and disparities are common in rural areas.

The officials are more oriented towards fulfilling the organizational requirements than benefiting the target groups. A typical government organization is viewed as bureaucratic and unresponsive by not touching the problems of poor (Richan, 1987). Non-governmental organizations (NGOs), on the other hand, are multiplying in number and area coverage. They are working in a small but significant way (Alliband, 1983). Often NGOs, involve in conflicts with bureaucracy due to lack of clarity of role of government organizations in relation to NGOs and differences in their working norms and style of functioning. But the fact is that government alone cannot deliver the goods to the people, especially to the disadvantaged.

Institutional approach to development

Economic development is essentially the product of collective action in the society. Individual stakes and interests can be enormously varied with not everyone gaining, or at least not gaining in the same degree. Finding ways of reducing the constraints on collective action is equally important. How can the return to opportunistic behaviour be reduced? How can norms of social trust and reciprocity be nurtured? How can information flows and property rights be made more precise? How can transaction costs be reduced? – These are questions that must constantly be raised to improve the quality of decisions in civic engagements. This emphasizes the role of institutions including the government and non-governmental organizations.

The Self-Help Groups (SHGs) method is successfully used by the government, NGOs and others worldwide to address various problems faced by rural community. The poor collect their savings and save it in banks. In return they receive easy access to loans with a small rate of interest to start their micro unit enterprise. Thousands of the poor and the marginalized population in India are building their lives, their families and their society through Self-Help Groups. The 9th five year plan of the government of India had given due recognition on the importance and the relevance of the Self-Help Group method to implement developmental schemes at the grassroots level (VOICE 2008).

The characteristics of the SHGs are, identical interest, small in size, credit repayment almost 100 per cent, mutual confidence, transparency in operations, democratic functioning, flexibility and responsiveness, voluntary performance, simple documentation, no collateral security, purpose of credit utilization not insisted by bank, minimum external intervention, and nominal interest for credit.

Self-Help Promoting Institutions (SHPIs)

The National Bank for Agriculture and Rural Development (NABARD) report (2005-06) suggests that there are 44,000 branches of 547 banks (47 commercial banks, 158 Regional Rural Banks (RRBs) and 342 co-operative banks) and 4,896 NGOs participating in SBLP. The role of NGOs in promoting and sustaining SBLP is generally assessed as very critical (Chakrabarti, 2004). The existing literature suggests that the cost of promotion per SHG incurred by an NGO is less than that of a bank (Harper, et al, 1998) often due to locational advantages. The major problems reportedly faced by SHPIs while promoting SHGs at the grass roots level include conflicts with moneylenders and the village bureaucracy. Moreover, the SHPIs have been facing problems like lack of finance and training support, shortage of field staff for promoting and

monitoring the SHGs, and lack of awareness/knowledge among local people in understanding the concept of SHGs.

Self-Help Group models

1. Model I: Where, Banks lend directly to the ultimate borrowers without having NGOs and SHGs as intermediaries.
2. Model II: Where, banks lend directly to the ultimate borrowers, and NGOs and SHGs are involved as non-financial intermediaries
3. Model III: Where, banks use SHGs as financial intermediaries to lend the credit to the borrowers, with NGOs as non-financial intermediaries.

The second model, where SHGs were formed and nurtured by the NGOs, was more popular among the bankers. Banks opened saving accounts and then provided credit directly to the SHGs, while NGOs acted as facilitators. This approach has been widely accepted by the practitioners partly because of the large scale participation of state government through development agencies like the District Rural Development Agency (DRDA), District Women Development Agency (DWDA), and some of the centrally sponsored social sector missions, and also because of special initiatives of NABARD.

About sixteen percent of the SHGs were credit linked under the third model where NGOs acted as facilitators as well as microfinance intermediaries. Under this model, NGOs formed SHG federations and then facilitated them to assume the role of MFIs. This model is expected to gain wider recognition with smaller banks venturing into large scale financing of SHGs.

Under the first model SHG linkages were facilitated through NABARD's policy of converting regional rural banks (RRBs) into self-help promoting institutions (SHPIs).

Statement of the research problem

Self Help Groups as an institution for the human interaction gained popularity in the rural set up especially among the rural woman. This has become an important strategy for government and Non-government organizations (NGOs) to achieve people participation in the rural development. They encourage people to participate in microfinance and entrepreneurial activities. The most significant question is how these strategies perform both in government and Non-government sectors? Comparative studies on Self-help groups are less researched. It is interesting to compare the growth, organizational and operational methods and performances of self-help groups both in government sector and NGO sector. Since the mid-90s, there has been a spate of critical studies on the impact of the micro credit (Puhazhendi and Badatya (2002), Puhazhendhi and Satyasai (2000) Khandker (2005)). These studies have covered a wide gamut of issues ranging from the direct economic impact of the credit on the income levels of the people below poverty line to more qualitative aspects such as social empowerment and entrepreneurial skills development among women. Studies have also addressed the factors that explain the success of group lending. (Dutta(2004), Puhazhendhi&Satyasai (1993)). Among these factors which are found to have varying degree of influence on their success are the social ties among the group members, internal pressure to repay the loan, peer monitoring i.e., the ability of borrowers to monitor each other's investment behaviour during the course of the loan, etc. have been identified.

Malcom Harper (2002) conducted a comparative study of the SHG promotion work of banks, NGOs, Village Volunteer Vahini clubs (VVs), Government agencies and individual 'volunteer' promoters functioning in Orissa, Uttar Pradesh and Karnataka. The findings of the study along with other outcomes show that the strengths and weaknesses of the SHGs are fairly evenly spread irrespective of the type of SHPI by which they were promoted. Studies also focus on either impact assessment or explaining the internal

factors which account for the success or failure of the Self Help Groups. They narrowly focus on their programmatic success. They focus on the issues like Self Help Group as a credit agency, as an entrepreneurship development agency, as a group entrepreneurship encouraging scheme, as a voluntary association, as a mechanism of implementing government rural development scheme and Self Help Group as a women empowerment scheme etc. However, there are strong external factors, which in turn decide the activities - funding and monitoring of the Self Help Groups. These external factors vary in their nature and influence depending upon whether they are in the public sector i.e., the government sector or the Voluntary sector namely NGOs. In the case of the latter, there is another level of influence, albeit indirect, i.e., the policies and goals of the organizations which fund these NGOs. This will be true of the government-aided SHGs too if the Governments concerned have taken external aid for promoting SHGs. Here the author seeks to address this problem by comparing across SHGs promoted by NGOs and Other agencies by analysing organizational, operational and empowerment aspects of SHGs.

Methodology

For the comparison of the performance of Self Help Groups sponsored by various SHPIs three major aspects such as organizational, operational and empowerment aspects are taken into consideration. Organizational aspect consisting of various organisational support rendered by the promoting agencies to the members. It consists of five indicators such as - i) frequency of meeting, ii) effectiveness of follow-up meetings, iii) Weightage given to participant's opinion, iv) visit of officials (field staff) to the work spot, v) rate of attendance during the meeting.

Various indicators of Operational aspect intended to measure how these institutes operationalize the capacity building strategy of the organisation. They include i) - method adopted to discuss problems, ii) practicability of solutions offered, iii) Innovative ideas initiated and implemented iv) cost effectiveness of the solutions offered v) responsibility shared by the SHGs.

Empowerment aspect deals with the measures taken by the promoting agencies to achieve women empowerment. It includes indicators such as i) capacity building among weaker sections through training, discussion and periodic meetings, ii) information given about government schemes, iii) support given to organise marginalised people, iv) Weightage given to mass awareness programmes, v) SHG's promote participation.

The respondents were asked to rate the working of SHGs with respect to the above parameters. The SHG ratings on each aspect from members were classified in five groups: Excellent, Very Good, Good, Satisfactory, poor. On the basis of opinion of the sample members scores are assigned ranging from 5 (excellent) to 1 (poor). Average performance scores have been obtained on the basis of weighted index method.

$$(N_1 \cdot X_1 + N_2 \cdot X_2 + N_3 \cdot X_3 + N_4 \cdot X_4 + N_5 \cdot X_5)$$

$$\text{Average score} = \frac{\quad}{(N_1 + N_2 + N_3 + N_4 + N_5)}$$

Where N_1 = Number of respondents who said excellent, N_2 = Number of respondents who said very good, N_3 = Number of respondents who said good, N_4 = Number of respondents who said satisfactory and N_5 = Number of respondents who said poor and $X_1 = 5$ (Excellent), $X_2 = 4$ (Very Good), $X_3 = 3$ (Good), $X_4 = 2$ (Satisfactory) and $X_5 = 1$ (Poor).

Finally the significance of difference in performance of SHGs sponsored by each agency is tested with the help of independent T-test.

Study region and selection of sample

The research study is undertaken in Dakshina Kannada district of Karnataka state in India. The district witnessed a rapid growth in the number of SHGs due to the initiatives taken by the NGOs and other agencies. The study is confined only to three Taluks of the district namely Mangalore, Belthangady, and Bantwal as these three Taluks exhibit remarkable progress in the SHGs movement. Ten SHGs each from government, NGOs and other sectors are selected at random from each study region (30 SHGs for one study region). Hence a total of 90 SHGs were selected. Structure of the sample SHGs are given in table 1.

Table - 1: Sample SHGs

Taluks	Government	NGO's	Others	Total
Mangalore	10	10	10	30
Belthangady	10	10	10	30
Bantwal	10	10	10	30
Total	30	30	30	90

Sample SHG members:

A complete list of members in the selected SHGs was obtained from the officials of the SHGs and three members each from government and other sponsored SHGs and four members each from NGO promoted groups are selected in random. In case of non-availability of the selected SHG members, other SHG members were called from the list and the required information was collected through questionnaire. All together 300 members were selected as respondents (TableNo. 2). Only women groups are selected as sample members considering the large number of women SHGs.

Table - 2: Sample SHG Members

Taluks	Government	NGO's	Others	Total
Mangalore	30	40	30	100
Belthangady	30	40	30	100
Bantwal	30	40	30	100
Total	90	120	90	300

Scope and limitations of the study

This study attempts to investigate the organisational and operational performance of SHGs. However, the performances of SHGs are determined by socio-economic background of members, which are not attempted here in this study. Such impacts are very comprehensive and complex. This study attempts only to analyse the economic impact mainly in terms of employment and income. Organisational and operational aspects of SHGs also vary from place to place and group to group owing to the regional variations and efficiency of the members.

Comparison of performance

Table 3 explains performance level scores of government promoted SHGs. It shows that around 60.0 per cent respondents are of the opinion that organisational aspects of these SHGs are excellent while 14.0 per cent feel that it is very good another 22.0 per cent respondents feel that it is good and satisfactory. But no respondent mentioned the performance as poor. This also shows that members are satisfied with the frequency of meetings held with the average score of 4.27 followed by the effectiveness of follow up meeting which is much above the total average score of 4.14. Regarding operational aspects about 66.0 per cent respondents say that it is excellent or very good. In the operational aspects, innovative ideas initiated

and implemented scores 4.18 while the total average score of all parameters is 4.10. In terms of empowerment aspect about 71.0 per cent respondents have agreed that it is excellent or very good. Among the parameters of empowerment, while the total average score is 2.26, supports given to organize marginalized people and information given about Government Schemes score 4.27 and 4.26 respectively.

Table 4 depicts the performance level score of the NGO sponsored SHGs. About 84.0 per cent of the respondents in these groups rank organisational aspect either excellent or very good. Out of the average score of 4.46, Effectiveness of follow-up meetings considered by the respondents effective with 4.63 score. The operational aspects scores slightly lower than the organisational level score with a total average score of 4.58 followed by empowerment aspect. Similarly performance level scores have been calculated for the SHGs sponsored by the other agencies also. A comparative analysis of the performance level scores of the SHGs sponsored by all the three agencies shows that SHGs promoted by NGOs are performing better than the government sponsored SHGs and other agencies.

Self Help Groups sponsored by NGOs scored higher average in all three selected performance indicators such as organisational aspects (4.46), operational aspect (4.55) and empowerment aspect (4.28) while the average score for the government sponsored SHGs the average score in these indicators is 4.14, 4.10 and 4.26 respectively.

Table - 3 (A): Performance level score (Government promoted SHGs)

A - Organizational Aspect							
SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score*
1	Frequency of meeting	58 (65.0)	14 (15.0)	3 (3.33)	15 (16.67)	-	4.27
2	Effectiveness of follow-up meetings	56 (62)	11 (12.67)	8 (8.67)	15 (16.67)		4.20
3	Weightage given to participants opinion	52 (58.3)	13 (14.0)	10 (11.0)	15 (16.67)	-	4.13
4	Visit of field officials to the work spot	54 (59.6)	11 (12.0)	9 (10.0)	16 (18.33)	-	4.14
5	Rate of attendance during meeting	50 (55.0)	17 (19.33)	7 (7.67)	16 (18.0)	-	4.12
Total		54 (60.0)	13 (14.4)	7 (7.8)	15 (16.7)		4.14

Source: Field Survey

Note: 5-Excellent, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage.

Table - 3 (B): Performance level score (Government promoted SHGs)

B - Operational aspect							
SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score*
1	Method adopted to discuss problems	58 (57.33)	18 (18.33)	9 (13.33)	5 (5.2)	-	4.44
2	Practicability of solutions offered	54 (60.0)	14 (16.0)	7 (7.33)	15 (16.67)	-	4.18
3	Innovative ideas initiated and implemented	57 (63.33)	14 (15.0)	5 (5.0)	14 (16.67)	-	4.26
4	Cost effectiveness of the solutions offered	47 (52.67)	13 (14.0)	13 (14.67)	17 (18.67)	-	4.00
5	Responsibility shared by the SHPIs	52 (57.67)	13 (14.67)	9 (10.0)	16 (17.67)	-	4.12
Total		52 (57.8)	14 (15.6)	9 (10.0)	13 (14.4)		4.10

Source: Field Survey

Note: 5-Excellent, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage.

Table - 3 (C): Performance level score (Government promoted SHGs)

C - Empowerment Aspect							
SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score*
1	Capacity building among weaker sections through training, discussion and periodic meetings	50 (55.33)	17 (19.33)	6 (6.67)	17 (18.6)	-	4.11
2	Information given about Government Schemes	57 (63.33)	14 (15.0)	5 (5.0)	14 (15.66)	-	4.26
3	Support given to organize marginalized people	58 (64.0)	14 (15.0)	3 (3.33)	15 (16.66)	-	4.27
4	Weightage given to mass awareness programmes	62 (69.0)	11 (11.67)	2 (1.67)	15 (16.66)	-	4.33
5	SHPI s promote participation	56 (61.67)	13 (14.0)	6 (6.67)	15 (17.67)	-	4.22
Total		57 (63.3)	14 (15.6)	4 (4.4)	15 (16.7)		4.26

Source: Field Survey

Note: 5-Excellent, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage.

Table - 4 (A): Performance level score (NGO promoted SHGs)

A - Organizational Aspect							
SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score
1	Frequency of meeting	81 (67.8)	15 (12.5)	17 (14.2)	7 (5.8)	-	4.42
2	Effectiveness of follow-up meetings	89 (74.4)	18 (15.2)	13 (10.8)	-		4.63
3	Weightage given to participants opinion	76 (63.3)	22 (18.3)	16 (13.3)	6 (5.0)	-	4.40
4	Visit of field officials to the work spot	75 (62.5)	20 (16.7)	14 (11.1)	11 (9.2)	-	4.33
5	Rate of attendance during meeting	79 (65.8)	28 (23.3)	11 (9.2)	2 (1.7)	-	4.53
Total		80 (66.7)	21 (17.5)	14 (11.7)	5 (4.2)		4.46

Source: Field Survey

Note: 5-Excellent, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table - 4 (B): Performance level score (NGO promoted SHGs)

B - Operational aspect							
SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score
1	Method adopted to discuss problems	83 (68.8)	21 (18.0)	10 (8.0)	6 (5.2)	-	4.51
2	Practicability of solutions offered	86 (72.0)	23 (19.2)	11 (8.8)	-	-	4.63
3	Innovative ideas initiated and implemented	91 (76.0)	22 (18.0)	7 (6.0)	-	-	4.70
4	Cost effectiveness of the solutions offered	86 (63.2)	25 (20.8)	16 (13.6)	3 (2.4)	-	4.53
5	Responsibility shared by the SHPIs	83 (69.2)	21 (17.6)	14 (12.0)	2 (1.2)	-	4.54
Total		86 (71.7)	21 (17.5)	11 (9.2)	2 (1.6)		4.58

Source: Field Survey

Note: 5-Excellent, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table - 4 (C): Performance level score (NGO promoted SHGs)

C - Empowerment Aspect							
SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score
1	Capacity building among weaker sections through training, discussion and periodic meetings	66 (55.3)	23 (19.3)	9 (6.6)	22 (18.6)	-	4.11
2	Information given about Government Schemes	76 (63.3)	18 (15.0)	6 (5.0)	20 (16.67)	-	4.25
3	Support given to organize marginalized people	78 (65.0)	30 (25.0)	4 (3.3)	8 (6.6)	-	4.48
4	Weightage given to mass awareness programmes	84 (70.0)	14 (11.6)	2 (1.6)	20 (16.67)	-	4.35
5	SHPI s promote participation	74 (61.6)	17 (14.0)	8 (6.6)	21 (17.6)	-	4.20
Total		76 (63.3)	20 (16.67)	6 (5.00)	18 (15.00)		4.28

Source: Field Survey

Note: 5-Excellent, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor

Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table - 5 (A): Performance level score (SHGs promoted by others)

SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score
A - Organisational Aspect							
1	Frequency of meeting	59 (65.0)	14 (15.0)	2 (3.3)	15 (16.67)	-	4.3
2	Effectiveness of follow-up meetings	56 (62)	11 (12.6)	8 (8.6)	15 (16.67)		4.20
3	Weightage given to participants opinion	52 (58.3)	13 (14)	10 (11.0)	15 (16.67)	-	4.13
4	Visit of field officials to the work spot	54 (59.6)	11 (12.0)	9 (10.0)	16 (18.33)	-	4.14
5	Rate of attendance during meeting	50 (55.0)	17 (19.3)	7 (7.6)	18 (18.0)	-	4.12
Total		54 (60.0)	13 (14.4)	8 (8.9)	15 (16.7)		4.17

Source: Field Survey.

Note: a)5-Excellent, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor.

b) Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table - 5 (B): Performance level score (SHGs promoted by others)

B - Operational aspect							
SN	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score
1	Method adopted to discuss problems	53 (59.0)	14 (15.0)	13 (14.0)	10 (12)	-	4.22
2	Practicability of solutions offered	54 (60.0)	14 (16)	7 (7.3)	15 (16.67)	-	4.18
3	Innovative ideas initiated and implemented	57 (63.3)	14 (15.0)	4 (5.0)	15 (16.67)	-	4.25
4	Cost effectiveness of the solutions offered	47 (52.6)	20 (27.3)	14 (16.1)	9 (10.0)	-	4.16
5	Responsibility shared by the SHPIs	52 (57.6)	13 (14.6)	9 (10.0)	16 (17.6)	-	4.12
Total		53 (58.9)	15 (16.7)	9 (10.0)	13 (14.4)		4.20

Source: Field Survey.

Note: a)5-Excellant, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor.

b) Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table - 5 (C): Performance level score (SHGs promoted by others)

C - Empowerment Aspect							
S N	Particulars	Excellent	Very Good	Good	Satisfactory	Poor	Average score
1	Capacity building among weaker sections through training, discussion and periodic meetings	50 (55.3)	17 (19.3)	6 (6.6)	17 (18.6)	-	4.11
2	Information given about Government Schemes	57 (63.3)	14 (15.0)	5 (5.0)	14 (16.67)	-	4.26
3	Support given to organize marginalized people	59 (65)	14 (15.0)	2 (3.3)	15 (16.67)	-	4.30
4	Weightage given to mass awareness programmes	63 (70.0)	10 (11.6)	2 (1.7)	15 (16.67)	-	4.34
5	SHPI s promote participation	55 (61.6)	13 (14)	6 (6.6)	16 (17.6)	-	4.18
Total		57 (63.3)	14 (15.6)	4 (4.4)	15 (16.7)		4.25

Source: Field Survey.

Note: a)5-Excellant, 4- Very good, 3- Good, 2-Satisfactory, 1- Poor.

b) Figures in parenthesis indicate percentage

Table –6: Average Performance Level Scores (Weighted)

A. Organisational Aspect				
SL No.	Indicators	Government	NGO	Others
1	Frequency of meeting	4.27	4.42	4.3
2	Effectiveness of follow-up meetings	4.20	4.63	4.20
3	Weightage given to participants opinion	4.13	4.40	4.13
4	Visit of officials to the work spot	4.14	4.33	4.14
5	Rate of attendance during meeting	4.12	4.53	4.12
6	Total average	4.14	4.46	4.17
B. Operational Aspect				
1	Method adopted to discuss problems	4.44	4.51	4.22
2	Practicability of solutions offered	4.18	4.63	4.18
3	Innovative ideas initiated and implemented	4.26	4.70	4.25
4	Cost effectiveness of the solutions offered	4.00	4.53	4.16
5	Responsibility shared by the SHPIs	4.12	4.54	4.12
6	Total average	4.10	4.58	4.20
C. Empowerment Aspect				
1	Capacity building among weaker sections through training, discussion and periodic meetings	4.11	4.11	4.11
2	Information given about Government Schemes	4.26	4.25	4.26
3	Support given to organize marginalized people	4.27	4.48	4.30
4	Weightage given to mass awareness programmes	4.33	4.35	4.34
5	SHPI s promote participation	4.22	4.20	4.18
6	Total average	4.26	4.28	4.25

Table (6) shows the average scores of SHGs of all three types of SHGs promoting organisations. These scores measure the performance of SHGs. Even though the scores differ for different parameters, overall average shows that NGO promoted SHGs are performing better than the Government sponsored SHGs and other agencies. Even though the SHGs sponsored by other agencies are falling below average of NGOs, they are performing better than the Government sponsored SHGs. The average scores of organisational aspect shows that NGO sponsored SHGs are attained higher average score (4.46) compared to Government (4.14) and others promoted SHGs (4.17). In Operational aspect performance score of NGO sponsored SHGs is higher (4.58) than other with 4.10 for government and 4.20 for SHGs promoted by others. In case of

empowerment aspect of course the difference is not so significant. But here too NGOs score marginally higher (4.28) than the Government (4.26) and others sponsored (4.25) SHGs.

Self Help Groups sponsored by Government, NGOs and others, performance of each organisation has been measured and compared and statistically proved with the help of independent T test. It will help us to prove the level of significance of difference in performance of SHGs promoted by different agencies.

Independent T-Test to Measure difference in Performance of Government and NGO Promoted SHGs:

Following table (6.10a) shows the result of independent T test applied to measure the significance of difference in performance of SHGs promoted by Government and NGOs. The first box (Group Statistics), tells the means and standard deviation of the groups. From this we can see that first mean $M_1 = 4.21$ and $M_2 = 4.44$ and first Standard Deviation = 1.11 and 0.884 for the government sponsored and NGO sponsored SHGs respectively.

From the Table 6.10b we get results of the two tests – Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances and t-test for equality of means. The table contains two sets of analysis, the first one assuming equal variances in the two groups and the second one assuming unequal variances. The Levene’s test tells us which statistic to consider analysing the equality of the means. It tests the null hypothesis that the two groups have equal variances. A small value of significance associated with Levene’s test indicates that the two groups have unequal variances and the null hypothesis is false. In the present study a very small value of this test statistic indicates that the two promoting agencies, NGO and Government do not have equal variance. Therefore, the statistic associated with equal variances not assumed should be used for the t-test for equality of means.

The T-test results (with equal variances not assumed)(Table 7)show the T-statistics of -2.803 with 500.89 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is 0.005, which is less than 0.05 as well as less than 0.01. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis at 5% and at 1% level of significance, which means that the average performance of the SHGs sponsored by the two promoters is significantly different from each other. However, if we were to test the assumption that the performance of NGO is better than that of the Government promoted SHGs, the null and alternative hypothesis would be different and we would need the p-value of one tailed test. The new hypotheses would be

H_0 : Mean score of NGO SHGs \leq Mean score of Government SHGs

H_1 : Mean score of NGO SHGs $>$ Mean score of Government SHGs

The one - tailed significance value or p - value can be obtained by dividing the two-tailed value by two. Thus the one tailed p-value in this case would be 0.0025 which is less than 0.05 as well as 0.01. There we reject the null hypotheses and conclude that the performance of NGO sponsored SHG is better than the performance of Government promoted SHGs.

Table –7:T- test for Difference between the performances of Government & NGO promoted SHGs (Overall performance)

(a) Group Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Government	270	4.2104	1.11076	.06760
NGO	360	4.4406	.88467	.04663

(b): Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	24.631	.000	-2.894	628	.004	-.23019
Equal variances not assumed			-2.803	500.890	.005	-.23019

T-test for measuring difference of performance between Government and NGO promoted SHGs in each aspect is given below.

Table - 8: T-test for Difference between Government & NGO Performance in Organizational Aspect

(a) Group Statistics (1: Gov, 2: NGO)

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Government	90	4.1756	1.14708	.12091
NGO	120	4.4617	.82921	.07570

(b) Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	15.536	.000	-2.098	208	.037	-.28611
Equal variances not assumed			-2.006	154.665	.047	-.28611

Table - 9: T-test for Difference between Government & NGO Performance in Operational Aspect

(a) Group Statistics

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Government	90	4.2044	1.08015	.11386
NGO	120	4.5817	.71338	.06512

(b) Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	27.798	.000	-3.043	208	.003	-.37722
Equal variances not assumed			-2.876	145.138	.005	-.37722

Table - 10: T-test for Difference between Government & NGO performance in Empowerment Aspect**(a) Group Statistics**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Government	90	4.2511	1.11519	.11755
NGO	120	4.2783	1.05712	.09650

(b) Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	.206	.650	-.180	208	.857	-.02722
Equal variances not assumed			-.179	186.150	.858	-.02722

In the table 10 performance levels of Government sponsored and NGO promoted SHGs is compared in respect of empowerment aspect. The first box (Group Statistics), (6.13a) tells the means and standard deviation of the groups. From this we can see that first mean $M_1 = 4.25$ and $M_2 = 4.27$ and first Standard Deviation = 1.11 and 1.05 for the Government and NGO sponsored SHGs respectively.

The T-test results conclude that there is no significant difference between the empowerment aspect of Government sponsored and SHGs promoted by NGOs.

Comparison of SHG Sponsored by Government and others

Here an attempt is made to compare the overall performance of SHGs promoted by the other promoting agencies with Government promoted SHGs and NGO sponsored SHGs. The t-test results for the comparison are discussed below.

Table - 11: T-test for Difference between the performances of Government& Others sponsored SHGs (Overall)**(a) Group Statistics (1: Others, 2: Government)**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Others	270	4.2044	1.11801	.06804
Government	270	4.2104	1.11076	.06760

(b) Independent Samples test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	.001	.974	-.062	538	.951	-.00593
Equal variances not assumed			-.062	537.977	.951	-.00593

In the table 11 performance levels of Government sponsored and SHGs promoted by others is compared. The first box (Group Statistics), (Table 6.14a) tells the means and standard deviation of the groups. From this we can see that first mean $M_1 = 4.20$ and $M_2 = 4.21$ and first Standard Deviation = 1.11 and 1.11 for the other sponsored and Government sponsored SHGs respectively.

The T-test results conclude that there is no significance difference between the performance of Government sponsored and SHGs promoted by others.

Table - 12: T- test for Difference between the performances of NGOs & Others sponsored SHGs (Overall)**(a) Group Statistics (1: Others, 2: NGO)**

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Others	270	4.2044	1.11801	.06804
NGO	360	4.4406	.88467	.04663

(b) Independent Samples Test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-test for equality of means			
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
Equal variances assumed	24.545	.000	-2.958	628	.003	-.23611
Equal variances not assumed			-2.863	498.583	.004	-.23611

In the table 12 performance levels of NGO sponsored and others promoted SHGs is compared. The first box (Group Statistics), (12 a) tells the means and standard deviation of the groups. From this we can see that first mean $M_1 = 4.20$ and $M_2 = 4.44$ and first Standard Deviation = 1.11 and .88 for the other sponsored and NGO sponsored SHGs respectively.

The T-test results (with equal variances not assumed) (Table 12 b) show the T-statistics of -2.863 with 498.58 degrees of freedom. The corresponding two-tailed p-value is .004, which is less than 0.05 as well as less than 0.01. Therefore, we can reject the null hypothesis at 5% and at 1% level of significance, which means that the average performance of the SHGs sponsored by the two promoters is significantly different from each other and SHGs promoted by NGOs are performing better than the others' sponsored SHGs.

REFERENCE

- Alliband Terry, 1983. Catalysts of Development: Voluntary Agencies in India, Kumeria Press, U.S.A.
- Chakrabarti, Rajsh. 2004. The India Microfinance Experience – Accomplishments and Challenges, in Bibek Debroy and Amir Ullah Khan eds. 'Integrating the Rural Poor into Markets', Academic Foundation, New Delhi.
- Dutta, Dipankar. 2004. Micro credit in rural Bangladesh: Is it reaching the poorest? Journal of Microfinance, 6 (1), 55-81.
- Harper M, Esipisu E, Mohanty A K and Rao DSK, 1998. The New Middle women, Profitable Banking through on-lending groups, Oxford/IBH New Delhi, ITDG Publications London.
- Kabir N., 2001. Conflicts over credit: Re-Evaluating the Empowerment Potential of Loans to Women in Rural Bangladesh – World Development, Vol. 29, No. 1.
- Khandker R. Shahidur. 2005. Microfinance and poverty: Evidence using panel data from Bangladesh, The World Bank Economic Review Advance Access.
- Malcolm Harper, 2002. Promotion of Self Help Groups under the SHG Bank Linkage Programme in India, Paper presented at the Seminar on SHG-bank Linkage Programme at New Delhi on 25th and 26th November 2002
- Puhazhendi, V and K C Badatya. 2002. "SHG-Bank Linkage Programmeme for Rural Poor-An Impact Assessment" Paper presented at seminar on SBLP at New Delhi, 25-26 November, NABARD, Mumbai.
- Puhazhendi, V and Satyasai, K.J.S (NABARD). 2000. "Microfinance for Rural People: An impact evaluation", Mumbai, India
- Richan Willard C., 1987. Beyond Altruism: Social Welfare Policy in American Society, The Haworth Press Inc., Binghamton, NY.
- VOICE (Voluntary Operation in Community & Environment), 2008. A Report on the Success and Failure of SHGs in India - Impediments and Paradigm of Success, A report submitted to Planning Commission of India, New Delhi.